



LANDMARKS
PRESERVATION
COMMISSION
NOTICE OF DECISION

DATE OF BOARD DECISION: August 5, 2021
DATE NOTICE MAILED: January 10, 2022
APPEAL PERIOD EXPIRATION: January 25, 2022
EFFECTIVE DATE OF PERMIT (Barring Appeal or Certification): January 26, 2022¹

1325 Arch Street

The Schneider/Kroeber House

Landmark application (#LMSAP2020-0008) for consideration of City Landmark or Structure of Merit designation status for a single-family residence – APN 060-2465-027-00.

The Landmarks Preservation Commission of the City of Berkeley, after conducting a public hearing, **APPROVED** the following permit:

PERMITS REQUIRED:

- City Landmark designation status, pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 3.24.110.A

INITIATED BY: Landmarks Preservation Commission

ZONING DISTRICT: Single-Family Residential/Hillside Overlay (R-1/H)

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW STATUS: Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15331 of the CEQA Guidelines for Historical Resource Rehabilitation.

The application materials for this project are available online at:

¹ Pursuant to BMC Section 23B.32.090, the City Council may “certify” any decision of the LPC for review, which has the same effect as an appeal. In most cases, the Council must certify the LPC decision during the 14-day appeal period. However, pursuant to BMC Section 1.04.070, if any portion of the appeal period falls within a Council recess, the deadline for Council certification is suspended until the first Council meeting after the recess, plus the number of days of the appeal period that occurred during the recess, minus one day. If there is no appeal or certification, the Use Permit becomes effective the day after the certification deadline has passed.

<http://www.cityofberkeley.info/zoningapplications>

FINDINGS, CONDITIONS AND APPROVED PLANS ARE ATTACHED TO THIS NOTICE

COMMISSION VOTE: 6-0-0-3

YES: ADAMS, ENCHILL, FINACOM, JOHNSON, LEUSCHNER, MONTGOMERY

NO: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: CRANDALL, SCHWARTZ, TWU

TO APPEAL THIS DECISION (see Section 3.24.300 of the Berkeley Municipal Code):

To appeal a decision of the Landmarks Preservation Commission to the City Council you must:

1. Submit a letter clearly and concisely setting forth the grounds for the appeal to the City Clerk, located at 2180 Milvia Street, 1st Floor, Berkeley; or by facsimile to (510) 981-6901. The City Clerk's telephone number is (510) 981-6900.
 - a. Pursuant to BMC Section 3.24.300.A, an appeal may be taken to the City Council by the application of the owners of the property or their authorized agents, or by the application of at least fifty residents of the City aggrieved or affected by any determination of the Commission made under the provisions of Chapter 3.24.
2. The appeal must be received prior to 5:00 p.m. on the "APPEAL PERIOD EXPIRATION" date shown above (if the close of the appeal period falls on a weekend or holiday, then the appeal period expires the following business day).
3. Submit the required fee (checks and money orders must be payable to 'City of Berkeley'):
 - a. The basic fee for persons other than the applicant is \$500. This fee may be reduced to \$100 if the appeal is signed by persons who lease or own at least 50 percent of the parcels or dwelling units within 300 feet of the project site, or at least 25 such persons (not including dependent children), whichever is less.
 - b. The fee for appeals of affordable housing projects (defined as projects which provide 50 percent or more affordable units for households earning 80% or less of Area Median Income) is \$500, which may not be reduced.
 - c. The fee for all appeals by Applicants is \$2500.

If no appeal is received, the landmark designation will be final on the first business day

following expiration of the appeal period.

NOTICE CONCERNING YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS:

If you object to this decision, the following requirements and restrictions apply:

1. If you challenge this decision in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Landmarks Preservation Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing.
2. You must appeal to the City Council within fifteen (15) days after the Notice of Decision of the action of the Landmarks Preservation Commission is mailed. It is your obligation to notify the Land Use Planning Division in writing of your desire to receive a Notice of Decision when it is completed.
3. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6(b) and Government Code Section 65009(c)(1), no lawsuit challenging a City Council decision, as defined by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6(e), regarding a use permit, variance or other permit may be filed more than ninety (90) days after the date the decision becomes final, as defined in Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6(b). Any lawsuit not filed within that ninety (90) day period will be barred.
4. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66020(d)(1), notice is hereby given to the applicant that the 90-day protest period for any fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions included in any permit approval begins upon final action by the City, and that any challenge must be filed within this 90-day period.
5. If you believe that this decision or any condition attached to it denies you any reasonable economic use of the subject property, was not sufficiently related to a legitimate public purpose, was not sufficiently proportional to any impact of the project, or for any other reason constitutes a “taking” of property for public use without just compensation under the California or United States Constitutions, your appeal of this decision must including the following information:
 - A. That this belief is a basis of your appeal.
 - B. Why you believe that the decision or condition constitutes a "taking" of property as set forth above.
 - C. All evidence and argument in support of your belief that the decision or condition constitutes a “taking” as set forth above.

If you do not do so, you will waive any legal right to claim that your property has been taken, both before the City Council and in court.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Communications to Berkeley boards, commissions or committees are public record and will become part of the City's electronic records, which are accessible through the City's website. **Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to a City board, commission or committee, will become part of the public record.** If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service or in person to the secretary of the relevant board, commission or committee. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the secretary to the relevant board, commission or committee for further information.

FURTHER INFORMATION:

Questions about the project should be directed to the project planner, Fatema Crane, at (510) 981-7410 or fcrane@cityofberkeley.info or lpc@cityofberkeley.info

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Findings and Conditions
2. Landmark application



ATTEST: _____
Fatema Crane, Secretary
Landmarks Preservation Commission

Cc: City Clerk
Property Owner: Golden Bear, LLC, 1325 Arch Street, Berkeley

FINDINGS

AUGUST 5, 2021

1325 Arch Street – The Schneider/Kroeber House

City of Berkeley Landmark Application #LMIN2020-0008

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Landmark Designation of the property at 1325 Arch Street [APN 060-2465-027-00] – The Schneider/Kroeber House

CEQA FINDINGS

1. The project is found to be exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Public Resources Code §21000, et seq.) pursuant to Section 15061.b.3 of the CEQA Guidelines (activities that can be seen with certainty to have no significant effect on the environment).

LANDMARK PRESERVATION ORDINANCE FINDINGS

2. Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) Section 3.24.110.A.1.b of the Landmarks Preservation Ordinance, and based on the evidence presented in the Landmark application, the Landmarks Preservation Commission of the City of Berkeley (Commission) finds that the subject property warrants designation as a City Landmark because it is an outstanding example of the First Bay Tradition architectural style and the Chalet sub-style of master architect Bernard Maybeck. The extant building was constructed in 1907 and retains its original character defining features, which reflect this style, such as: undisguised natural materials and wood siding; vertical building forms; steeply pitched, cross-gable roof and extensive eaves; wood doors, windows and trim; exposed framing elements, rafters, brackets and beams; combination of traditional craftsmanship and historic motifs; deck and porches that integrate the building interior with the natural surroundings; The property retains historical integrity, evident in its design, materials and workmanship. For these reasons, the building meets the *architectural merit* criterion and warrants designation.
3. Pursuant to BMC Section 3.24.110.A.2, the Commission further finds that the subject property warrants City Landmark designation for its association with the *movement and evolution of culture* as represented by the efforts of the Hillside Club to encourage the creation of buildings in Berkeley, like those of the First Bay Tradition, that employ natural materials and integrate with the environment and hillside terrain. The group was active during the property's historic period and their influence can be seen in the design of the subject building.
4. Consistent with BMC Section 3.24.110.A.4 criteria for *historic value*, the subject property is found to embody and express the history of Berkeley, the region, State, and Nation, through its association with the anthropologist Alfred Kroeber and his wife Theodora (née

Kracaw) Kroeber, and daughter, Ursula K. Le Guin. The Kroebers resided and worked at 1325 Arch Street from 1927 to 1979; this work had far-reaching impacts within the field of anthropology as well as controversial outcomes for indigenous people. Prominent and trail-blazing author Ursula Le Guin grew up there, in her own words, “from birth to maturity,” and identified her experiences living in the house as seminal to her way of thinking and her approach to writing.

FEATURES TO BE PRESERVED, OR RESTORED WHERE POSSIBLE

PART 1: This designation shall apply to the subject property and the following distinguishing features shall be preserved:

General Building Composition

- Swiss Chalet, Arts and Crafts architectural style
- Three-story height at front (west), two-story at rear (east)
- Overall massing and building forms
- Use of exclusively unpainted wood exterior materials
- Extensive, wide eaves
- Location, size and style of all doors and windows
- Location, dimensions and size of all decks and porches

Roof

- Cross-gable roof of 1907 building
- Gable roof of 1933 addition
- Dark-colored shingle roof

Finishes and Details Throughout

- Unpainted wood exterior: all board cladding, exposed beams, trim, decks, porches, stairs, doors, windows and sashes
- Wood siding patterns, including grooved/beveled board and board-and-batten, with corner boards and columns, and specified horizontal or vertical orientation throughout
- All-wood windows, including trim, sills and sashes; various fixed, awning and casement styles
- Decorative metal end caps on beams and brackets

West Elevation

- Three-story massing
- Gable wall
- Exposed rafters/beams
- Brackets and metal end caps
- Vertical corner boards and columns

- Overall arrangement and location of doors, windows and decks
- Third story: vertical board siding; three vertically-oriented windows and a door with a single lite, served by a right-aligned deck with a wood railing featuring a decorative cut-out pattern.
- Second story: Horizontal wood board siding, one horizontally-oriented casement window, and a double-door with four lites per door (two squares above two rectangles) and vertically-oriented window, all served by a right-aligned wrapping deck (extending to the south elevation) featuring a wood railing with a decorative cut-out pattern.
- First story: Horizontal wood board siding.

- *1933 rear building addition (beyond front façade):* vertical board siding throughout; a door with four lites, arranged horizontally, on the lower level; and a window with four lites, arranged in quadrants on the upper level.

East (Rear) Elevation

- Two-story height
- Overall arrangement and location of doors, windows and decks
- Beams with brackets and metal end caps (supporting decks and trellis, described below)
- Vertical corner boards and columns
- Second story: vertical board siding; a large three-part window; one small, nearly-square window with a high sill; deck with wood railing featuring decorative cut-out patterns.
- First Story: entry alcove featuring vertical siding and a Dutch-style main entry door with single pane of clear glass in upper portion; horizontal board siding, double-door with four lites per door (two squares above two rectangles), and a wood trellis (beneath the second story deck above).

- *1933 rear building addition:* gable wall; vertical board siding; right-aligned porch deck with wood cut-out railing and wood stairs¹, a door with four lites (two square lites above two rectangular lites) and general arrangement and placement of windows. Note that current windows are not original to 1933.

South (Side) Elevation

- Gable wall
- Exposed rafters/beams
- Brackets and metal end caps
- Vertical corner boards and columns
- Overall arrangement and location of doors, windows and decks
- Third story: vertical siding throughout; two (small) single-pane windows; an enclosed sleeping porch featuring the original deck with wood railings with decorative cut out patterns combining classical baluster and apple motifs.
- Second story: horizontal siding with vertical siding at the entry enclosure wall and at the rear wing; two doors with four lites (two squares above two rectangles), served by a left-aligned wrapping wood deck (wrapping onto the west elevation) with wood cut-

¹ In 2021, the stairs had no railing but such a condition would be not required in order for the subject building to retain its historical significance.

out railing; one (small) single-light window with a scroll sawn wood cut decorative trim within entry wall enclosure; two-lite casement window at rear wing; entry porch low-wall (former flower box).

- First story (far west portion of building only): vertical board siding.
- *1933 rear building addition:* vertical board siding on the upper story, a window containing two casement windows on either end of a fixed, central pane, and one high-sill, two-light window on the upper story; horizontal board siding on lower story, one (small) two-light casement window (serving the kitchen), two two-lite casement windows, and one wood door with four lites (two squares above two rectangles) on the lower level.

North (Side) Elevation

- Two-story height at east increasing to three stories at west
- Gable wall
- Overall arrangement and location of doors, windows and decks
- Brackets and metal end caps
- Horizontal wood siding on lower stories, vertical on upper (third) story
- Vertical corner boards and columns
- Cement-clad chimney with terra cotta roof-tile accents
- Third story (uppermost): vertical siding; two single-lite wooden windows
- Second story: horizontal siding; one three-part awning-style wood window and one two-lite casement window
- First story (far west portion of building only): horizontal siding; one single-pane (awning?) window.
- Bay enclosure: vertical siding throughout; one wood door with glazed window, a Juliet balcony with wood railings featuring decorative cut out pattern combining classical baluster and apple motifs; two wood vents at lower story.
- *1933 rear building addition:* vertical board siding throughout; one stained glass window and one single-pane window at lower level.

Detached garage

- General location and small-scale, single-story structure

Features of the Site

- Rhyolite stone retaining walls at property line low rustic stone walls flanking steps/pathway ascending to front door

PART 2: Where possible, the following distinguishing features shall be restored:

- Clear window glazing
- Decorative metal end caps on beams and brackets
- Exterior lighting fixtures consistent with the overall architectural character and historic period of the house.



An Artistic House
designed by one of California's leading architects. Very well built. Large living room with excellent acoustics; sleeping porches. "A house with possibilities." View one of the finest in Berkeley. Neighborhood unexcelled. Attractive garden. Lot has a frontage of sixty feet.
This house **MUST BE SOLD**. It is offered for \$1,500 less than it cost to build.
1325 Arch Street.

"I think what I'm saying is that I grew up in utopia—in this one respect: the house I lived in. No metaphor. Literally, physically, bodily, the house."

Ursula Le Guin, 2018, interview in [California Magazine](#).

City of Berkeley Ordinance #4694 N.S. LANDMARK APPLICATION

**"Semper Virens"
SCHNEIDER / KROEBER HOUSE
1325 Arch Street**

**Submitted to the City of Berkeley Landmarks Preservation Commission
July 12 and July 15, 2021**

Recorder: Steven Finacom

(Page Left Intentionally Blank)

Images on cover: Advertisement from Berkeley Daily Gazette, July 4, 1913. Black and white photograph at left by Thos. W Tenney, BAHA, used with permission. Color photograph at right, 2021, Steven Finacom, rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction - page 4

Acknowledgements - page 7

Questions and Answers, #1-13 and #17-18 of Landmark Application form - page 8

Executive Summary - page 11

Question #14: Description of Property - page 13

- a. Architectural Description of Current House, By Elevation and Area**
- b. Description of Current Garden**

Question #15: History of Property - page 52

- a. History of the Neighborhood - page 57**
- b. Pre-Contact and Early European Exploration - page 57**
- c. Spanish / Mexican Era - page 59**
- d. Start of American Era to Present - page 59**
- e. Development of the 1300 Block of Arch Street - page 61**
- f. Lot #30 at 1325 Arch Street - page 65**
- g. The House at 1325 Arch - page 68**
- h. Bernard Maybeck, and the Design of the House - page 73**
- i. Design Context for the Schneider / Kroeber House - page 77**
- j. Changes to the House - page 88**
- k. Changes to the Garden - page 91**
- l. Historical, Scholarly and Architectural Recognition of the House - page 96**

Question #16: Significance of the House - page 100

Key Individuals Associated with 1325 Arch - page 111

- a. Albert Schneider - page 111**
- b. Interlude between Schneider and Kroeber ownership of 1325 Arch - page 119**
- c. Professor Clarence Haring - page 121**
- d. The Kroebers - page 123**
- e. Alfred Kroeber - page 124**
- f. Theodora Kroeber - page 135**
- g. Ursula LeGuin - page 139**
- h. Individuals of the Recent Past - page 144**

Question #19. Bibliography and Sources - page 145

INTRODUCTION

ORGANIZATION OF THIS APPLICATION

This application follows the format established on the application form for City of Berkeley Landmarks. The form presents nineteen questions (some of them with multiple parts) to be addressed.

Some of the questions have simple answers of one word, or a short phrase or sentence. Others—like the description of the architecture and history of the property—call for much more detailed and extensive answers.

To simplify the presentation of this material, the “short” questions are presented and answered first, then the “long” questions, including **Description, History, Significance**, are presented next.

The last question on the Application is regarding sources. A Bibliography of primary sources is presented. Citations are provided in body of the text of the document, not in footnotes or as endnotes. Citations may not directly reference specific items in the Bibliography. For example, the Bibliography refers to types of material found on ancestry.com including newspaper articles. An in-text citation might say, specifically, this quote comes from the *Oakland Tribune*, July 31, 1921. The Bibliography, in comparison, will simply reference the Oakland Tribune as a source, not include the date of each issue cited in the text.

RECORDER’S NOTE

This was a very interesting and unusual landmark application to research and write. To me, every landmark application is interesting and unusual in its own way, but this one particularly stands out.

One might surmise that the story of a Maybeck-designed house—especially one that has attracted admirers and critical written analysis for more than a century—has already been thoroughly told. There is, in fact, a great deal already written about it. Most of the architectural and cultural historians who have ably written about Berkeley architecture—including Cardwell, Brechin, Freudenheim, Cerny, Woodbridge, Bernardi, Wilson, Bruce—have had something direct and insightful to say about this house, and they are quoted and summarized in this narrative. I am greatly indebted to their work. Almost all architectural / community history in Berkeley is informed by the research and analysis of those who have gone before, and the story of 1325 Arch is no different.

We also are lucky to have part of the story of the house told in the written words of two skilled, non-architectural, writers, Ursula Le Guin and her mother, Theodora Kroeber. I use numerous quotes from them, and others, in this narrative. I haven’t calculated, but as much as fifty percent of the text may be direct quotes.

In the case of a landmark application it is often the primary responsibility of the Recorder to organize and place in context material from original primary informants and from experts and scholars, rather than attempt a stand-alone rewrite or rethinking of the work of others. In that respect a landmark application is a piece of factual / scholarly documentation but is not intended, unlike other types of scholarly and historical writing, to make a mark as something completely new and original.

However, one of the early surprises of my research was that there are some mistakes and mysteries in the history of 1325 Arch, where I was able to locate and organize more accurate material and correct errors.

The most interesting of these situations involves Albert Schneider, the man who commissioned the house (on a lot his wife owned, we might add, to give full credit to one of the women so often overlooked in historical narratives).

As the Application describes, most of the accounts of the house, going back decades, say Schneider was a classics professor at the University of California. He was not. He was, in fact, a man with a medical school degree, a bacteriologist, an expert in microscopy, a pharmacologist, and someone with an avid personal and experimental interest in both the effects (including hallucinogenic) of plants on humans and the ways in which science could be used to solve crimes. In fact, a case has been made by expert authority (Willard Oliver) that when he utilized his research equipment to assist his close collaborator, Berkeley Police Chief August Vollmer, Schneider developed the first modern police crime laboratory in the nation and has a firm place in the evolution of “scientific policing” and modern criminology.

Schneider’s relationship to 1325 Arch is more complex than a linear story of “*he built it, he lived there, then he sold it*”. During the latter part of his “ownership” period he was living, at least part time, in at least three other residential buildings in Berkeley, although his direct residence at 1325 Arch can be thoroughly documented for several early years.

In addition, the period between Schneider and the next set of well-known residents—the Kroebers—is confused and somewhat mysterious. There are a dozen or more non-Schneider residents of the house who pop up in a decade between the mid-teens and mid-1920s, and the name of the owner of the house between the Schneiders and the Kroebers seems not to have been known until now. I believe I have discovered the name of that owner, and his relationship to the house.

The preparation of this landmark application faced unprecedented research challenges, at least for our present day. People who have not worked directly on landmark research themselves are often prone to the touching fantasy that all the material can be easily collected in a few short trips to well organized archives, and one simply has to tweak this pre-digested material to produce a finished product. Or, better yet, someone else has already done all the hard work of researching and documenting a property and it remains only to quote and cite that person. That is not the case at all.

Landmark applications are comprised of hundreds, if not thousands, of fragments of research. The lucky researcher can find many of them in a few places. Often, however, hours of research work might not produce anything useful to the application, and lead to dead ends. This research project was no exception. My guess is that I spent at least 100 hours working on research and writing and that is not at all unrealistic for a landmark application that aims to be reasonably thorough.

FUTURE RESEARCH AND SUPPLEMENTS TO THIS APPLICATION

The proposal to initiate the property 1325 Arch for Landmark consideration was made in late 2019. Within a few months, the COVID-19 Pandemic emerged, and Berkeley, like much of the world, entered a “lockdown” period of disruption and closures that would last for more than a year, and is still not fully lifted.

As a result, two important sources of research material for this project were not available before this application was completed:

- first, the property ownership records contained in the Alameda County Recorder’s office. These are still not available for in-person research. The information they contain would help clarify some important aspects of the history of 1325 Arch;
- Second, research materials in the Bancroft Library. Among other things, extensive administrative records of the campus that could have shed light on the three UC faculty members who owned the house were not accessible in time to inform this writing and, more importantly, neither are four tantalizing boxes of the papers of Albert Schneider that are housed in the Bancroft.

At this point, however, I don’t believe that material to be found in those two archives would substantially change the basic findings of this application. Otherwise, I would not submit it for Landmarks Commission review.

However, those research materials, when accessible, will have useful additional information and I may be able to prepare a supplement to the Application with additional details on the history of the house and its owners. Further research will hopefully clarify:

- When the Schneiders sold the house and, perhaps, why they sold, along with why they built it;
- Further details of Professor Schneider’s academic career at the University of California and how and why he came to leave the University;
- the exact period when the Harings purchased / apparently owned the house, and when the Kroebers came to purchase it. (When an exact date of the Kroeber purchase is found, it will also be possible to work backwards and hopefully find in a local paper, a copy of the key advertisement described in written memoirs that brought them to purchase the house.)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

On the other side of the understandable lack of access to key research archives, I have much thanks to give for those who were able to provide help during the Pandemic with this research. In particular, I would like to thank:

- **Anthony Bruce, Fran Cappelletti, and Daniella Thompson**, all associated with the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association (BAHA). Each of them provided, on request, key components of research materials and contextual background. BAHA's research library was also especially helpful. On many occasions BAHA has provided the historical reference material essential to an accurate account of a historic building in Berkeley, much of that material obscure and unexpected. For example, during the research for this application Anthony Bruce handed me a small book on the evolution of "Swiss chalet" architecture which I ended up quoting extensively in the application to set the context for how the design of the Schneider house came about. As I reviewed it I found the book, written in 1913, even contained a first hand description of the Schneider / Kroeber House soon after it was completed;
- Representatives of the current owners of the house, **Hilary Flack** and **Kristen Sidell**. They provided an invaluable set of historical research materials, including copies of original architectural drawings of 1325 Arch obtained from the Environmental Design Archives at UC Berkeley, as well as access to the property on the exterior, to take photographs and examine the current character of the house and its garden;
- **Will Oliver**, the biographer of August Vollmer and the first scholar I can identify to write an accurate biographical description of Albert Schneider and connect the "true" Professor Schneider to the house at 1325 Arch. He provided insights on Schneider both in his book on Vollmer, and correspondence with the Recorder;
- **Theo Downes-Le Guin**, son of Ursula Le Guin, one of the able custodians of his mother's literary legacy, who provided, from afar, very helpful insights and information on the house and the long association of his family with it;
- Finally, an **individual unknown**. Around 1985 a friend of Lisa Stadthofer, then owner of the house, did a considerable amount of research and compiled a set of original documentary materials and their own analysis into a narrative about the history and evolution of the house. This material has been critical in the documentation of the house, and I wish the name of the individual who prepared it was known, so they could be thanked here by name.

Berkeley's **Landmarks Preservation Ordinance** directs the Landmarks Commission to "*(A) establish and maintain a list of structures, sites, and areas deemed deserving of official recognition... (B) carry out, assist and collaborate in studies and programs designed to identify and evaluate structures, sites and areas worthy of preservation... (C) consult with and consider the ideas and recommendations of civic groups, public agencies and citizens interested in historic preservation (D) Inspect structures, sites and areas which it has reason to believe worthy of preservation with the permission of the owner or the owner's agent (E) Disseminate information to the public concerning those structures, sites and areas deemed worthy of preservation.*" Research and preparation of this Landmark Application was undertaken in furtherance of those charges.

11. Present Owners. Golden Bear LLC (please consult Hilary Flack for further contact information)

Present Use: Private single family residence. Residential / Single Family.

Current Zoning: R1-H

Adjacent Property Zoning: R1-H

13. Present Condition of Property

Exterior: Excellent

Interior: Excellent

Grounds: Excellent

Note: the immediately previous owners left the house in excellent condition after undertaking a number of repairs and restorations over the years. The grounds are regularly maintained by a gardener.

Has the property's exterior been altered? Yes, but not in ways that compromise the original architecture or historic character. Primary alterations include: construction of a two story rear addition during the Period of Significance; certain modifications to original windows and doors / door openings, and replacement of some windows and doors; roofing the south facing sleeping porch, and installing windows to 'wall' that space (the original porch was open air, and covered with a cloth awning); repairs and reconstruction of significant features, including balconies, balustrades, and horizontal and vertical wood siding—almost all observable repairs / reconstructions have been sensitively done and compatible with the original character of the house.

14. Description: (see page 13)

15. History: (see page 52)

16. Significance: (see page 100)

Historic Value:

National, State, County, City, Neighborhood.

Architectural Value:

National, State, County, City, Neighborhood.

17. Is the property endangered? Not at present. The current owners intend to use the property as a single family home. However, the majority of the Berkeley City Council recently advocated for the elimination of single family zoning, and legislation is pending at the State level to eliminate local zoning controls. This could mean that a future owner could demolish the house and replace it with a multi-family structure, without the possibility of objection.

18: Photographs: Date: Repository: various repositories and dates, including Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, Environmental Design Archives (University of California, Berkeley), and on-line sources, as cited in text. Some photographs are taken from published books, to provide historic context. In those cases the image used is a portion, not the full image from the book, and the published source and identified photographer are given.

Present day photographs of the house taken by Recorder, Steven Finacom, not to be used without permission of the photographer, except for inclusion in City documents including this Application pertaining to the landmarking of this property.

Quotations from other sources are cited in the text. Overall text copyright by the Recorder. Authorship must be cited in direct quotations of original text.

Photographer: various. **Current (2020 and 2021) pictures taken by the Recorder.**

19. Bibliography (see page 145)

20. Recorder: Steven Finacom. (Acting as Recorder only, not Applicant. The Landmarks Preservation Commission is in the role the Applicant.)

Date: Submitted July 12, 2021

Organization: Member, Landmarks Preservation Commission.